## PATENT Docket No. SU 103 US

BEGEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER NOV 0 9 2007

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Application of Michael J. Precopio

Serial No. 10/519, 372

Examiner: Neil Levy

Filed: 12/23/2004

Art Unit: 1615

Title: METHODS FOR TREATING ECTOPARASITE INFECTIONS ON THE

MAMMALIAN BODY

## **FAX CERTIFICATE**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being telefaxed to:, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450; on 11/09/2007 fax number 571-273-8300.

Henry E. Millson, Jr. Typed or printed name of certifier

## SUMMARY OF THE PERSONAL INTERVIEW OF OCTOBER 30, 2007

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a summary of the above personal interview containing a statement of the substance of the interview in accordance with 37 CFR 1.133 (b) and MPEP Section 713.04.

75 --- 8

Serial No. 10/519, 372

Art Unit: 1615

1) Brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted.

None.

2) Identification of the claims discussed.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 20-26, 33-36 and 45-63

3) Identification of the specific prior art discussed.

Gans et al US 2003/0040504

Lover 4, 368, 207

Besette U.S. 2005/004233

Cardin et al 5, 288, 483

Pearlman 6, 303, 581

The above prior art was discussed generally with respect to what was not disclosed with respect to the instantly claimed invention.

4) Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed.

The amendments set forth in applicant's response dated 06/04/2007.

5) Brief identification of the general thrust of the arguments presented to the Examiner.

That suffocation will kill any ectoparasite.

That excessive experimentation is not required in view of the teachings in the specification.

That alternative formula (I) alcohols have groups that are chemically inert except for the benzyl alcohol type structure common to all.

08/05/2006 08:08 19284452453 PAGE 03/03

Scrial No. 10/519, 372

Art Unit: 1615

1 .- 5. . .

That the references used for the section 103 rejection do not render the claims obvious in view of the arguments presented on pages 8-16 and 19 of the response dated 10/04/2007.

That obviousness type double patenting does not apply, particularly in view of the 1.132 Declaration of record.

6) General indication of any other pertinent matters discussed.

None.

7) General results or outcome of the interview.

Described in the Interview Summary form from the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry E. Milison, Jr.

Reg. No. 18980

675 Golden Hawk Drive Prescott, Arizona 86301

phone and fax (928) 445-2453

my E. mellion f.

hemil3@cablconc.net